

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Applicants respond to the Office Action and traverse all rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 12, 16, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Examiner states “[i]t is not clear with respect to which claim element the PPP link is being resynchronized. The PPP link is never claimed to be [in] synchronization with anything.” But the claims state that resynchronization is for the PPP link and the specification as originally filed defines this resynchronization. Please see paragraphs 1022-1047 describing the configuration with respect to the network server and the conditions under which resynchronization may be required. Therefore, claims are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235).

All of Applicants’ claims are novel and patentable over Kim. Kim does not recite all features of Applicants’ claims. For example, claim 1, and all Applicants’ claims, recite resynching if there is a new network server for a PPP link. A network server is distinct from a RNC as recited in Kim. As stated in Kim, “a radio network controller (RNC for controlling a radio channel allocation to the mobile station and for controlling, matching the network, a path of a packet service service or a circuit data service.” Please see Kim col. 4, lines 5-8. Such a device is distinct from a network server as in Applicants’ claims. The device in Kim essentially allocates channels, which is an entirely different function from a server. Even Kim draws this distinction in FIG. 2 where the RNC is distinct from the internet/PPDN and the ISP.

All of Applicants’ claims are novel and patentable over Kim and in a position for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 19, 21, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235).

Claims 2, 13, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235) in view of Rasanen (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,545).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235) in view of Ludwig (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,218).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235) in view of Kalliokulju (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,451).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,235) in view of Basilier (U.S. Patent No. 6,78,536).

As explained above for the Section 102 rejections, Kim does not teach the features relied upon to make the Section 103 rejections. Therefore, all of Applicants' claims are patentable over Kim alone, and Kim in conjunction with any cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees that may be due with this response or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2006

By: /Rupit Patel/

Rupit Patel, Reg. No. 53,441
(858) 651-7435

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502